



INDIANA
DEPARTMENT OF
CHILD
SERVICES

*Protecting our children,
families and future*

Department of Child Services Practice Indicator Reports For June 2008

Region 02 June 2008



**Published
July 2008**



DCS Practice Indicator Report


Initial Assessment - Use of Substitute Care

Trended for June 2007 to June 2008


April 2008 to June 2008

| Location | Reports Taken Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | | Cases Substantiated Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Count | Percent Resulting in Screen Outs | Count | Percent Resulting in Removal |
| Statewide | 21,780 | 15.11% | 8,065 | 27.64% |
| Region 2 | 983 | 36.01% | 247 | 21.46% |
| Jasper | 64 | 35.94% | 16 | 0.00% |


Statewide Percent Removal



Region 2 Percent Removal



Jasper County Percent Removal





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Initial Assessment - Use of Substitute Care

Trended for June 2007 to June 2008


April 2008 to June 2008

| Location | Reports Taken Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | | Cases Substantiated Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | |
|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | Count | Percent Resulting in Screen Outs | Count | Percent Resulting in Removal |
| Statewide | 21,780 | 15.11% | 8,065 | 27.64% |
| Region 2 | 983 | 36.01% | 247 | 21.46% |
| Laporte | 380 | 26.05% | 62 | 33.87% |


Statewide Percent Removal



Region 2 Percent Removal



Laporte County Percent Removal





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Initial Assessment - Use of Substitute Care

Trended for June 2007 to June 2008


April 2008 to June 2008

| Location | Reports Taken Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | | Cases Substantiated Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | |
|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | Count | Percent Resulting in Screen Outs | Count | Percent Resulting in Removal |
| Statewide | 21,780 | 15.11% | 8,065 | 27.64% |
| Region 2 | 983 | 36.01% | 247 | 21.46% |
| Newton | 53 | 18.87% | 30 | 16.67% |


Statewide Percent Removal



Region 2 Percent Removal



Newton County Percent Removal





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Initial Assessment - Use of Substitute Care

Trended for June 2007 to June 2008

April 2008 to June 2008


| Location | Reports Taken Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | | Cases Substantiated Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Count | Percent Resulting in Screen Outs | Count | Percent Resulting in Removal |
| Statewide | 21,780 | 15.11% | 8,065 | 27.64% |
| Region 2 | 983 | 36.01% | 247 | 21.46% |
| Porter | 282 | 35.82% | 110 | 16.36% |

Statewide Percent Removal




Percent Removal

Region 2 Percent Removal



Percent Removal

Porter County Percent Removal



Percent Removal





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Initial Assessment - Use of Substitute Care

Trended for June 2007 to June 2008


April 2008 to June 2008

| Location | Reports Taken Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | | Cases Substantiated Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Count | Percent Resulting in Screen Outs | Count | Percent Resulting in Removal |
| Statewide | 21,780 | 15.11% | 8,065 | 27.64% |
| Region 2 | 983 | 36.01% | 247 | 21.46% |
| Pulaski | 29 | 20.69% | 15 | 26.67% |


Statewide Percent Removal



Region 2 Percent Removal



Pulaski County Percent Removal





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Initial Assessment - Use of Substitute Care

Trended for June 2007 to June 2008


April 2008 to June 2008

| Location | Reports Taken Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | | Cases Substantiated Rolling Quarter For Apr 2008 to Jun 2008 | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Count | Percent Resulting in Screen Outs | Count | Percent Resulting in Removal |
| Statewide | 21,780 | 15.11% | 8,065 | 27.64% |
| Region 2 | 983 | 36.01% | 247 | 21.46% |
| Starke | 175 | 65.71% | 14 | 35.71% |


Statewide Percent Removal



Region 2 Percent Removal



Starke County Percent Removal





DCS Practice Indicator Report


CHINS Placements by County

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | Total CHINS | Own Home | | Relative Home | | Foster Homes | | Residential Care | | Other | |
|---------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Statewide | 14358 | 4048 | 28.19% | 2556 | 17.80% | 5784 | 40.28% | 1512 | 10.53% | 458 | 3.19% |
| Region 2 | 506 | 130 | 25.69% | 97 | 19.17% | 200 | 39.53% | 66 | 13.04% | 13 | 2.57% |
| Jasper County | 31 | 1 | 3.23% | 2 | 6.45% | 18 | 58.06% | 10 | 32.26% | 0 | 0.00% |


Statewide Percentage Breakdown



Region 2 Percentage Breakdown



Jasper County Percentage Breakdown





DCS Practice Indicator Report


CHINS Placements by County

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | Total CHINS | Own Home | | Relative Home | | Foster Homes | | Residential Care | | Other | |
|----------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Statewide | 14358 | 4048 | 28.19% | 2556 | 17.80% | 5784 | 40.28% | 1512 | 10.53% | 458 | 3.19% |
| Region 2 | 506 | 130 | 25.69% | 97 | 19.17% | 200 | 39.53% | 66 | 13.04% | 13 | 2.57% |
| Laporte County | 70 | 20 | 28.57% | 8 | 11.43% | 31 | 44.29% | 10 | 14.29% | 1 | 1.43% |


Statewide Percentage Breakdown



Region 2 Percentage Breakdown



Laporte County Percentage Breakdown






DCS Practice Indicator Report CHINS Placements by County For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | Total CHINS | Own Home | | Relative Home | | Foster Homes | | Residential Care | | Other | |
|---------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Statewide | 14358 | 4048 | 28.19% | 2556 | 17.80% | 5784 | 40.28% | 1512 | 10.53% | 458 | 3.19% |
| Region 2 | 506 | 130 | 25.69% | 97 | 19.17% | 200 | 39.53% | 66 | 13.04% | 13 | 2.57% |
| Newton County | 30 | 16 | 53.33% | 4 | 13.33% | 1 | 3.33% | 9 | 30.00% | 0 | 0.00% |


Statewide Percentage Breakdown



Region 2 Percentage Breakdown



Newton County Percentage Breakdown






DCS Practice Indicator Report CHINS Placements by County For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | Total CHINS | Own Home | | Relative Home | | Foster Homes | | Residential Care | | Other | |
|---------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Statewide | 14358 | 4048 | 28.19% | 2556 | 17.80% | 5784 | 40.28% | 1512 | 10.53% | 458 | 3.19% |
| Region 2 | 506 | 130 | 25.69% | 97 | 19.17% | 200 | 39.53% | 66 | 13.04% | 13 | 2.57% |
| Porter County | 279 | 61 | 21.86% | 69 | 24.73% | 115 | 41.22% | 23 | 8.24% | 11 | 3.94% |


Statewide Percentage Breakdown



Region 2 Percentage Breakdown



Porter County Percentage Breakdown






DCS Practice Indicator Report CHINS Placements by County For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | Total CHINS | Own Home | | Relative Home | | Foster Homes | | Residential Care | | Other | |
|----------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Statewide | 14358 | 4048 | 28.19% | 2556 | 17.80% | 5784 | 40.28% | 1512 | 10.53% | 458 | 3.19% |
| Region 2 | 506 | 130 | 25.69% | 97 | 19.17% | 200 | 39.53% | 66 | 13.04% | 13 | 2.57% |
| Pulaski County | 31 | 16 | 51.61% | 1 | 3.23% | 12 | 38.71% | 2 | 6.45% | 0 | 0.00% |


Statewide Percentage Breakdown



Region 2 Percentage Breakdown



Pulaski County Percentage Breakdown





DCS Practice Indicator Report


CHINS Placements by County

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | Total CHINS | Own Home | | Relative Home | | Foster Homes | | Residential Care | | Other | |
|---------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| Statewide | 14358 | 4048 | 28.19% | 2556 | 17.80% | 5784 | 40.28% | 1512 | 10.53% | 458 | 3.19% |
| Region 2 | 506 | 130 | 25.69% | 97 | 19.17% | 200 | 39.53% | 66 | 13.04% | 13 | 2.57% |
| Starke County | 65 | 16 | 24.62% | 13 | 20.00% | 23 | 35.38% | 12 | 18.46% | 1 | 1.54% |


Statewide Percentage Breakdown



Region 2 Percentage Breakdown



Starke County Percentage Breakdown






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Locally Placed CHINS


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Location | Total Out of Home Placements | Placed in Same County | Percent Locally Placed |
| Statewide | 10310 | 7570 | 73.42% |
| Region 2 | 376 | 224 | 59.57% |
| Jasper County | 30 | 10 | 33.33% |


Statewide Percent Placed Locally



Region 2 Percent Placed Locally



Jasper County Percent Placed Locally






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Locally Placed CHINS


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Location | Total Out of Home Placements | Placed in Same County | Percent Locally Placed |
| Statewide | 10310 | 7570 | 73.42% |
| Region 2 | 376 | 224 | 59.57% |
| Laporte County | 50 | 33 | 66.00% |


Statewide Percent Placed Locally



Region 2 Percent Placed Locally



Laporte County Percent Placed Locally






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Locally Placed CHINS


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Location | Total Out of Home Placements | Placed in Same County | Percent Locally Placed |
| Statewide | 10310 | 7570 | 73.42% |
| Region 2 | 376 | 224 | 59.57% |
| Newton County | 14 | 5 | 35.71% |


Statewide Percent Placed Locally



Region 2 Percent Placed Locally



Newton County Percent Placed Locally






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Locally Placed CHINS


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Location | Total Out of Home Placements | Placed in Same County | Percent Locally Placed |
| Statewide | 10310 | 7570 | 73.42% |
| Region 2 | 376 | 224 | 59.57% |
| Porter County | 218 | 146 | 66.97% |


Statewide Percent Placed Locally



Region 2 Percent Placed Locally



Porter County Percent Placed Locally






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Locally Placed CHINS


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Location | Total Out of Home Placements | Placed in Same County | Percent Locally Placed |
| Statewide | 10310 | 7570 | 73.42% |
| Region 2 | 376 | 224 | 59.57% |
| Pulaski County | 15 | 5 | 33.33% |


Statewide Percent Placed Locally



Region 2 Percent Placed Locally



Pulaski County Percent Placed Locally






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Locally Placed CHINS


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Location | Total Out of Home Placements | Placed in Same County | Percent Locally Placed |
| Statewide | 10310 | 7570 | 73.42% |
| Region 2 | 376 | 224 | 59.57% |
| Starke County | 49 | 25 | 51.02% |


Statewide Percent Placed Locally



Region 2 Percent Placed Locally



Starke County Percent Placed Locally






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Average Number of Placement Moves


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | |
|-----------|--|
| County | Average Number of Placements Per Child |
| Statewide | 2.81 |
| Region 2 | 3.24 |
| Jasper | 2.13 |


Statewide Average Number of Placements



Region 2 Average Number of Placements



Jasper County Average Number of Placements






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Average Number of Placement Moves


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | |
|-----------|--|
| County | Average Number of Placements Per Child |
| Statewide | 2.81 |
| Region 2 | 3.24 |
| Laporte | 2.55 |


Statewide Average Number of Placements



Region 2 Average Number of Placements



Laporte County Average Number of Placements








DCS Practice Indicator Report

Average Number of Placement Moves

For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | |
|-----------|--|
| County | Average Number of Placements Per Child |
| Statewide | 2.81 |
| Region 2 | 3.24 |
| Newton | 1.80 |








DCS Practice Indicator Report

Average Number of Placement Moves

For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | |
|-----------|--|
| County | Average Number of Placements Per Child |
| Statewide | 2.81 |
| Region 2 | 3.24 |
| Porter | 3.94 |








DCS Practice Indicator Report

Average Number of Placement Moves

For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | |
|-----------|--|
| County | Average Number of Placements Per Child |
| Statewide | 2.81 |
| Region 2 | 3.24 |
| Pulaski | 2.00 |






DCS Practice Indicator Report

Average Number of Placement Moves


For June 2007 to June 2008

| June 2008 | |
|-----------|--|
| County | Average Number of Placements Per Child |
| Statewide | 2.81 |
| Region 2 | 3.24 |
| Starke | 2.54 |


Statewide Average Number of Placements



Region 2 Average Number of Placements



Starke County Average Number of Placements





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Sibling Placement Report

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Count of Sibling Cases | Cases With All Children Placed Together | Percent Placed Together of Sibling Cases | Average Number of Children per Case |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Statewide | 2551 | 1686 | 66.09% | 2.71 |
| Region 2 | 90 | 49 | 54.44% | 2.66 |
| Jasper County | 6 | 3 | 50.00% | 3.17 |


Statewide Percent Together



Region 2 Percent Together



Jasper County Percent Together





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Sibling Placement Report

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Count of Sibling Cases | Cases With All Children Placed Together | Percent Placed Together of Sibling Cases | Average Number of Children per Case |
|----------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Statewide | 2551 | 1686 | 66.09% | 2.71 |
| Region 2 | 90 | 49 | 54.44% | 2.66 |
| Laporte County | 6 | 4 | 66.67% | 2.83 |


Statewide Percent Together



Region 2 Percent Together



Laporte County Percent Together





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Sibling Placement Report

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Count of Sibling Cases | Cases With All Children Placed Together | Percent Placed Together of Sibling Cases | Average Number of Children per Case |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Statewide | 2551 | 1686 | 66.09% | 2.71 |
| Region 2 | 90 | 49 | 54.44% | 2.66 |
| Newton County | 1 | 1 | 100.00% | 2.00 |


Statewide Percent Together



Region 2 Percent Together



Newton County Percent Together





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Sibling Placement Report

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Count of Sibling Cases | Cases With All Children Placed Together | Percent Placed Together of Sibling Cases | Average Number of Children per Case |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Statewide | 2551 | 1686 | 66.09% | 2.71 |
| Region 2 | 90 | 49 | 54.44% | 2.66 |
| Porter County | 61 | 32 | 52.46% | 2.59 |


Statewide Percent Together



Region 2 Percent Together



Porter County Percent Together





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Sibling Placement Report

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Count of Sibling Cases | Cases With All Children Placed Together | Percent Placed Together of Sibling Cases | Average Number of Children per Case |
|----------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Statewide | 2551 | 1686 | 66.09% | 2.71 |
| Region 2 | 90 | 49 | 54.44% | 2.66 |
| Pulaski County | 3 | 2 | 66.67% | 3.00 |


Statewide Percent Together



Region 2 Percent Together



Pulaski County Percent Together





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Sibling Placement Report

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Count of Sibling Cases | Cases With All Children Placed Together | Percent Placed Together of Sibling Cases | Average Number of Children per Case |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Statewide | 2551 | 1686 | 66.09% | 2.71 |
| Region 2 | 90 | 49 | 54.44% | 2.66 |
| Starke County | 13 | 7 | 53.85% | 2.62 |


Statewide Percent Together



Region 2 Percent Together



Starke County Percent Together





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Length of Stay in Out of Home Placement


Children in Out of Home Placement by Length of Time Since Latest Removal

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | One Year 0 to 365 Days | | Two Years 366 to 730 Days | | Three Years 731 to 1095 | | Three + Years 1096 Days+ | | Length Available Per Child | |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Average | Median |
| Statewide | 4,910 | 47.6% | 2,264 | 22.0% | 1,310 | 12.7% | 1,826 | 17.7% | 636.04 | 398.00 |
| Region 2 | 133 | 35.4% | 118 | 31.4% | 62 | 16.5% | 63 | 16.8% | 657.18 | 475.50 |
| Jasper | 2 | 6.7% | 16 | 53.3% | 9 | 30.0% | 3 | 10.0% | 678.04 | 541.50 |


Statewide Median Length



Region 2 Median Length



Jasper County Median Length





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Length of Stay in Out of Home Placement


Children in Out of Home Placement by Length of Time Since Latest Removal

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | One Year 0 to 365 Days | | Two Years 366 to 730 Days | | Three Years 731 to 1095 | | Three + Years 1096 Days+ | | Length Available Per Child | |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Average | Median |
| Statewide | 4,910 | 47.6% | 2,264 | 22.0% | 1,310 | 12.7% | 1,826 | 17.7% | 636.04 | 398.00 |
| Region 2 | 133 | 35.4% | 118 | 31.4% | 62 | 16.5% | 63 | 16.8% | 657.18 | 475.50 |
| Laporte | 26 | 52.0% | 13 | 26.0% | 4 | 8.0% | 7 | 14.0% | 608.76 | 355.50 |


Statewide Median Length



Region 2 Median Length



Laporte County Median Length





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Length of Stay in Out of Home Placement


Children in Out of Home Placement by Length of Time Since Latest Removal

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | One Year 0 to 365 Days | | Two Years 366 to 730 Days | | Three Years 731 to 1095 | | Three + Years 1096 Days+ | | Length Available Per Child | |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Average | Median |
| Statewide | 4,910 | 47.6% | 2,264 | 22.0% | 1,310 | 12.7% | 1,826 | 17.7% | 636.04 | 398.00 |
| Region 2 | 133 | 35.4% | 118 | 31.4% | 62 | 16.5% | 63 | 16.8% | 657.18 | 475.50 |
| Newton | 9 | 64.3% | 2 | 14.3% | 3 | 21.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 369.75 | 288.50 |


Statewide Median Length



Region 2 Median Length



Newton County Median Length





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Length of Stay in Out of Home Placement


Children in Out of Home Placement by Length of Time Since Latest Removal

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | One Year 0 to 365 Days | | Two Years 366 to 730 Days | | Three Years 731 to 1095 | | Three + Years 1096 Days+ | | Length Available Per Child | |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Average | Median |
| Statewide | 4,910 | 47.6% | 2,264 | 22.0% | 1,310 | 12.7% | 1,826 | 17.7% | 636.04 | 398.00 |
| Region 2 | 133 | 35.4% | 118 | 31.4% | 62 | 16.5% | 63 | 16.8% | 657.18 | 475.50 |
| Porter | 74 | 33.9% | 59 | 27.1% | 40 | 18.3% | 45 | 20.6% | 683.85 | 586.50 |


Statewide Median Length



Region 2 Median Length



Porter County Median Length





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Length of Stay in Out of Home Placement


Children in Out of Home Placement by Length of Time Since Latest Removal

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | One Year 0 to 365 Days | | Two Years 366 to 730 Days | | Three Years 731 to 1095 | | Three + Years 1096 Days+ | | Length Available Per Child | |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Average | Median |
| Statewide | 4,910 | 47.6% | 2,264 | 22.0% | 1,310 | 12.7% | 1,826 | 17.7% | 636.04 | 398.00 |
| Region 2 | 133 | 35.4% | 118 | 31.4% | 62 | 16.5% | 63 | 16.8% | 657.18 | 475.50 |
| Pulaski | 2 | 13.3% | 11 | 73.3% | 2 | 13.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 489.86 | 528.41 |


Statewide Median Length



Region 2 Median Length



Pulaski County Median Length





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Length of Stay in Out of Home Placement


Children in Out of Home Placement by Length of Time Since Latest Removal

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | One Year 0 to 365 Days | | Two Years 366 to 730 Days | | Three Years 731 to 1095 | | Three + Years 1096 Days+ | | Length Available Per Child | |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Average | Median |
| Statewide | 4,910 | 47.6% | 2,264 | 22.0% | 1,310 | 12.7% | 1,826 | 17.7% | 636.04 | 398.00 |
| Region 2 | 133 | 35.4% | 118 | 31.4% | 62 | 16.5% | 63 | 16.8% | 657.18 | 475.50 |
| Starke | 20 | 40.8% | 17 | 34.7% | 4 | 8.2% | 8 | 16.3% | 708.46 | 437.62 |


Statewide Median Length



Region 2 Median Length



Starke County Median Length





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Finalized Adoption Rates and Reunification Rates

For June 2007 to June 2008

June 2008


| Location | Out of Home CHINS with TPR at the end of May 2008 | Finalized Adoptions Entered During Jun 2008 | Percent of Adoptions to CHINS TPRs | Out of Home CHINS without TPR at the end of May 2008 | Reunifications Occuring During Jun 2008 | Percent Reunifications to CHINS without TPR |
|---------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statewide | 1,274 | 136 | 10.68% | 9,064 | 364 | 4.02% |
| Region 2 | 78 | 5 | 6.41% | 318 | 15 | 4.72% |
| Jasper County | 5 | 0 | 0.00% | 25 | 0 | 0.00% |

Statewide Rates




Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Region 2 Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Jasper County Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Finalized Adoption Rates and Reunification Rates

For June 2007 to June 2008

June 2008


| Location | Out of Home CHINS with TPR at the end of May 2008 | Finalized Adoptions Entered During Jun 2008 | Percent of Adoptions to CHINS TPRs | Out of Home CHINS without TPR at the end of May 2008 | Reunifications Occuring During Jun 2008 | Percent Reunifications to CHINS without TPR |
|----------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statewide | 1,274 | 136 | 10.68% | 9,064 | 364 | 4.02% |
| Region 2 | 78 | 5 | 6.41% | 318 | 15 | 4.72% |
| Laporte County | 9 | 1 | 11.11% | 47 | 5 | 10.64% |

Statewide Rates




Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Region 2 Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Laporte County Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Finalized Adoption Rates and Reunification Rates

For June 2007 to June 2008

June 2008


| Location | Out of Home CHINS with TPR at the end of May 2008 | Finalized Adoptions Entered During Jun 2008 | Percent of Adoptions to CHINS TPRs | Out of Home CHINS without TPR at the end of May 2008 | Reunifications Occuring During Jun 2008 | Percent Reunifications to CHINS without TPR |
|---------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statewide | 1,274 | 136 | 10.68% | 9,064 | 364 | 4.02% |
| Region 2 | 78 | 5 | 6.41% | 318 | 15 | 4.72% |
| Newton County | 1 | 1 | 100.00% | 18 | 3 | 16.67% |

Statewide Rates




Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Region 2 Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Newton County Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Finalized Adoption Rates and Reunification Rates

For June 2007 to June 2008

June 2008


| Location | Out of Home CHINS with TPR at the end of May 2008 | Finalized Adoptions Entered During Jun 2008 | Percent of Adoptions to CHINS TPRs | Out of Home CHINS without TPR at the end of May 2008 | Reunifications Occuring During Jun 2008 | Percent Reunifications to CHINS without TPR |
|---------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statewide | 1,274 | 136 | 10.68% | 9,064 | 364 | 4.02% |
| Region 2 | 78 | 5 | 6.41% | 318 | 15 | 4.72% |
| Porter County | 46 | 2 | 4.35% | 174 | 4 | 2.30% |

Statewide Rates




Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Region 2 Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Porter County Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Finalized Adoption Rates and Reunification Rates

For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| Location | Out of Home CHINS with TPR at the end of May 2008 | Finalized Adoptions Entered During Jun 2008 | Percent of Adoptions to CHINS TPRs | Out of Home CHINS without TPR at the end of May 2008 | Reunifications Occuring During Jun 2008 | Percent Reunifications to CHINS without TPR |
|----------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statewide | 1,274 | 136 | 10.68% | 9,064 | 364 | 4.02% |
| Region 2 | 78 | 5 | 6.41% | 318 | 15 | 4.72% |
| Pulaski County | 0 | 0 | NA | 16 | 0 | 0.00% |


Statewide Rates



Region 2 Rates



Pulaski County Rates





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Finalized Adoption Rates and Reunification Rates

For June 2007 to June 2008

June 2008


| Location | Out of Home CHINS with TPR at the end of May 2008 | Finalized Adoptions Entered During Jun 2008 | Percent of Adoptions to CHINS TPRs | Out of Home CHINS without TPR at the end of May 2008 | Reunifications Occuring During Jun 2008 | Percent Reunifications to CHINS without TPR |
|---------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Statewide | 1,274 | 136 | 10.68% | 9,064 | 364 | 4.02% |
| Region 2 | 78 | 5 | 6.41% | 318 | 15 | 4.72% |
| Starke County | 17 | 1 | 5.88% | 38 | 3 | 7.89% |

Statewide Rates




Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Region 2 Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate

Starke County Rates



Adoption Rate Reunification Rate






DCS Practice Indicator Report Visitations and Contacts Report

Average Visitations and Contacts per Child During the Report Month by County
For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Average FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Children with Visitations Occuring During the Month | Average Visitations Occuring per Child with Contact During the Month |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| Statewide | 10,025 | 2.22 | 950 | 2.92 |
| Region 2 | 339 | 2.30 | 62 | 2.69 |
| Jasper | 33 | 1.82 | 13 | 1.92 |


Statewide Average Visitations and Contacts



Region 2 Average Visitations and Contacts



Jasper County Average Visitations and Contacts






DCS Practice Indicator Report Visitations and Contacts Report

Average Visitations and Contacts per Child During the Report Month by County
For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Average FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Children with Visitations Occuring During the Month | Average Visitations Occuring per Child with Contact During the Month |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| Statewide | 10,025 | 2.22 | 950 | 2.92 |
| Region 2 | 339 | 2.30 | 62 | 2.69 |
| Laporte | 86 | 3.10 | 8 | 4.25 |


Statewide Average Visitations and Contacts



Region 2 Average Visitations and Contacts



Laporte County Average Visitations and Contacts





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Visitations and Contacts Report

Average Visitations and Contacts per Child During the Report Month by County
For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Average FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Children with Visitations Occuring During the Month | Average Visitations Occuring per Child with Contact During the Month |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| Statewide | 10,025 | 2.22 | 950 | 2.92 |
| Region 2 | 339 | 2.30 | 62 | 2.69 |
| Newton | 44 | 2.95 | 4 | 4.75 |


Statewide Average Visitations and Contacts



Region 2 Average Visitations and Contacts



Newton County Average Visitations and Contacts






DCS Practice Indicator Report Visitations and Contacts Report

Average Visitations and Contacts per Child During the Report Month by County
For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Average FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Children with Visitations Occuring During the Month | Average Visitations Occuring per Child with Contact During the Month |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| Statewide | 10,025 | 2.22 | 950 | 2.92 |
| Region 2 | 339 | 2.30 | 62 | 2.69 |
| Porter | 91 | 1.32 | 11 | 1.55 |


Statewide Average Visitations and Contacts



Region 2 Average Visitations and Contacts



Porter County Average Visitations and Contacts





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Visitations and Contacts Report

Average Visitations and Contacts per Child During the Report Month by County
For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Average FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Children with Visitations Occuring During the Month | Average Visitations Occuring per Child with Contact During the Month |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| Statewide | 10,025 | 2.22 | 950 | 2.92 |
| Region 2 | 339 | 2.30 | 62 | 2.69 |
| Pulaski | 24 | 2.00 | 9 | 2.22 |


Statewide Average Visitations and Contacts



Region 2 Average Visitations and Contacts



Pulaski County Average Visitations and Contacts






DCS Practice Indicator Report Visitations and Contacts Report

Average Visitations and Contacts per Child During the Report Month by County
For June 2007 to June 2008


June 2008

| County | FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Average FCM Contacts With Families Occuring During the Month | Children with Visitations Occuring During the Month | Average Visitations Occuring per Child with Contact During the Month |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| Statewide | 10,025 | 2.22 | 950 | 2.92 |
| Region 2 | 339 | 2.30 | 62 | 2.69 |
| Starke | 61 | 2.56 | 17 | 3.06 |


Statewide Average Visitations and Contacts



Region 2 Average Visitations and Contacts



Starke County Average Visitations and Contacts





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Trended Repeat Maltreatment

For June 2007 to June 2008


For June 2008

| County | Children With Substantiated Allegations During Rolling Quarter | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Count | Children With No Prior Maltreatment in the Prior 12 Months | Absence of Repeat Maltreatment Percent |
| Statewide | 7,953 | 6,987 | 87.85% |
| Region 2 | 246 | 219 | 89.02% |
| Jasper | 16 | 14 | 87.50% |


Statewide Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Region 2 Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Jasper County Absence of Repeat Maltreatment





DCS Practice Indicator Report

Trended Repeat Maltreatment

For June 2007 to June 2008


For June 2008

| County | Children With Substantiated Allegations During Rolling Quarter | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Count | Children With No Prior Maltreatment in the Prior 12 Months | Absence of Repeat Maltreatment Percent |
| Statewide | 7,953 | 6,987 | 87.85% |
| Region 2 | 246 | 219 | 89.02% |
| Laporte | 62 | 53 | 85.48% |


Statewide Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Region 2 Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Laporte County Absence of Repeat Maltreatment





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Trended Repeat Maltreatment

For June 2007 to June 2008


For June 2008

| County | Children With Substantiated Allegations During Rolling Quarter | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Count | Children With No Prior Maltreatment in the Prior 12 Months | Absence of Repeat Maltreatment Percent |
| Statewide | 7,953 | 6,987 | 87.85% |
| Region 2 | 246 | 219 | 89.02% |
| Newton | 30 | 24 | 80.00% |


Statewide Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Region 2 Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Newton County Absence of Repeat Maltreatment





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Trended Repeat Maltreatment

For June 2007 to June 2008


For June 2008

| County | Children With Substantiated Allegations During Rolling Quarter | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Count | Children With No Prior Maltreatment in the Prior 12 Months | Absence of Repeat Maltreatment Percent |
| Statewide | 7,953 | 6,987 | 87.85% |
| Region 2 | 246 | 219 | 89.02% |
| Porter | 110 | 101 | 91.82% |


Statewide Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Region 2 Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Porter County Absence of Repeat Maltreatment





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Trended Repeat Maltreatment

For June 2007 to June 2008


For June 2008

| County | Children With Substantiated Allegations During Rolling Quarter | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Count | Children With No Prior Maltreatment in the Prior 12 Months | Absence of Repeat Maltreatment Percent |
| Statewide | 7,953 | 6,987 | 87.85% |
| Region 2 | 246 | 219 | 89.02% |
| Pulaski | 14 | 14 | 100.00% |


Statewide Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Region 2 Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Pulaski County Absence of Repeat Maltreatment





DCS Practice Indicator Report


Trended Repeat Maltreatment

For June 2007 to June 2008


For June 2008

| County | Children With Substantiated Allegations During Rolling Quarter | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Count | Children With No Prior Maltreatment in the Prior 12 Months | Absence of Repeat Maltreatment Percent |
| Statewide | 7,953 | 6,987 | 87.85% |
| Region 2 | 246 | 219 | 89.02% |
| Starke | 14 | 13 | 92.86% |

Statewide Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Region 2 Absence of Repeat Maltreatment



Starke County Absence of Repeat Maltreatment

